REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 13, 15 to 17, 21, 27 and 33 to 44 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 21, 27 and 33 to 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 7,159,190 (Perry). Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry and further in view of admitted prior art. Claims 15, 21 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry and in further view of U.S. 6,724,492 (Iwase). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection/ these rejections are respectfully requested.

The present claims concern setting printer settings by a printer control apparatus using an entire setting screen to set an entire print attribute to be applied to the entire print data and a partial setting screen to set a partial print attribute to be applied to a part of the print data, wherein the partial setting screen is a screen in which the entire print attribute is reflected. In one aspect, the partial setting screen displays an entire setting screen to set an entire print attribute to be applied to the entire print data and then displays a partial setting screen including (i) a first designation field to set a partial print attribute to be applied to a part of the print data, and (ii) a second designation field to designate a page as the part of the print data to which the partial print attribute is applied. Since an initial value of the first designation field in the partial setting screen indicates that a print attribute the same as the entire print attribute is already set, it is not required of the user to reenter partial attributes which are the same values as for the entire print setting.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a printing control method executed in an information processing apparatus which has a printer driver to generate print data which a printing apparatus can process. The method includes: a first displaying step of displaying an entire setting screen to set an entire print attribute to be applied to the entire print data; a second displaying step of displaying a partial setting screen including (i) a first designation field to set a partial print attribute to be applied to a part of the print data, (ii) a second designation field to designate a page as the part of the print data to which the partial print attribute is applied; and a generating step of generating the print data to print a print material in which the entire print attribute and the partial print attribute are reflected.

In the Office Action, it is contended that "(i)t is inherent that the page template 317 of Fig.6A must display the existing settings for the stock of the entire print job, otherwise the user would be required to manually reenter every attribute even when a change for only one attribute is desired." However, Perry fails to disclose any processing to ensure that the page template is so constructed. It is precisely because Perry fails to disclose such processing that the Office Action contends that it is inherent that the page template 317 of Fig.6A must display the existing settings for the stock of the entire print job. Applicant respectfully submits that it is not inherent that the page template of Perry contains such a feature. Section 2112 of the M.P.E.P. states that "(i)n relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). In the Office Action, it is merely asserted that Perry's templates "must display the existing settings for the stock of the entire print job, otherwise the user would be required to manually reenter every attribute even when a change for

only one attribute is desired." However, this is merely a restatement of a feature of the present invention without any support that such a feature was contemplated in Perry.

For example, Perry discloses "(t)he apply button 360 allows the user to apply the saved editing changes or any modifications to current print job exceptions attributes or apply new print job exceptions attributes that have been added by the user selecting the add exception button 330." (See Perry column 8, lines 2 to 12.) Although this may mean that Perry allows a user to apply exception attributes to a print job, this is not at all the same as displaying a partial setting screen including (i) a first designation field to set a partial print attribute to be applied to a part of the print data, (ii) a second designation field to designate a page as the part of the print data to which the partial print attribute is applied as featured in the present claims. Moreover, referring to Fig. 6A of Perry, although Fig. 6A shows the stock of the exception pages, it cannot be said that the existing settings for the stock of the entire print job are displayed in Fig. 6A. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Perry fails to suggest or disclose the second displaying step or unit of the present claims.

In light of the deficiencies of Perry as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 7, 11 and 13 are directed to an apparatus, a system and a computer-readable storage medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 7, 11 and 13 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the

invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 4281402v1